

ELECTION

Special Cord
Election Edition

93

Tuesday
February 9
1993

Don't be a sheep, just say No

I imagine an election campaign where you never saw the candidates standing for election, never had the chance to hear their platforms, never saw them at open forum. With this lack of information, could you cast an informed vote?

Obviously, you could not. Your only reasonable course of action would be to vote 'no'.

Such a situation exists in this election campaign, not for the candidates, but for the referendum questions.

You are being asked to vote on three amendments to the by-laws of the Students' Union and Student Publications. By-laws are the basic operating rules of the Union and Publications -- a constitution.

They cannot be taken lightly. They should not be taken lightly. But the Students' Union and Student Publications are asking you to vote on these changes without any meaningful information.

The election notice mailed to each student does describe (briefly) the by-law changes. But that description is sorely deficient.

The potential consequences of the changes are not discussed. Worse yet, you, the voter, are not given any indication which change applies to which referendum question. If you are in favour of one change, and not another you simply do not know which question to vote for and which to vote against.

There will be some information on the questions beside the

ballot box on election day. That's not good enough, especially considering the very serious nature of the referendum questions.

Referendum information given only on election day -- even information in **The Cord** -- is simply not good enough.

Will 1 500 voters have the time to seriously debate these issues in the ten minutes between classes? Or will they simply check off 'yes' to be rid of the whole mess?

The Students' Union and Student Publications are banking on the latter, counting on your apathy to allow their referendum questions to be pushed through without real debate.

Don't let that happen. Vote 'no' for all of the referendum

questions. Vote 'no' to the arrogance that assumes all of you will, like a flock of drooling sheep, approve the referendum questions without asking any questions.

The Union and Publications are, at the very least, showing disrespect to the students it professes to represent, by being so tight-fisted with information.

The Union and Publications are undermining the very notion of 'accountable' student government by attempting to sneak the referendum questions by you without being called to question.

The opinions expressed in this editorial are those of the Cord Editorial Board and do not necessarily reflect those of the rest of The Cord staff, or its publisher, WLU Student Publications.

That is wrong. That should be opposed. That merits a 'no' vote.

If the referendum questions are defeated in this election, they can still be put forward again in March, for the scheduled by-election.

If you vote 'no' you will be telling the Students' Union and Student Publications that they must conduct a meaningful information campaign on all referendum questions. You'll be telling them to treat you with the respect you deserve.

Say 'yes' to accountable student government. And just say 'no' to the referendum questions.

1993 Presidential picks

Students' Union

With some elections, there is a clear division between candidates, with differing stances on the issues. With Fraser Kirby and Sean Taylor, the candidates for the presidency of the Students' Union, no such clear division exists.

Kirby and Taylor are in agreement with the basic direction the Students' Union should take next year. But there are important differences in how they would steer the Students' Union towards achieving these goals.

Both candidates think the Students' Union should be part of the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance [OUSA]. While we think that more debate on OUSA versus a membership in the Ontario Federation of Students is needed, that is irrelevant, at least for the moment. For this election, both Fraser Kirby and Sean Taylor support OUSA, and its questionable goals, wholeheartedly.

But there is one important difference between the two would-be presidents. Fraser Kirby would bring Laurier's membership in OUSA to referendum quickly. Taylor would wait until an agreement had been reached with government and business.

The difference may seem insubstantial, but it's not. Fraser Kirby would give students the opportunity to support or withdraw from OUSA. He would allow students their voice early enough to make a referendum a real decision instead of a rubber stamp.

Sean Taylor would hold a referendum only after it was too late to say no to OUSA. Taylor's position is profoundly unfair to students, and more than a little condescending.

His vision of the Students' Union is also disturbing. He says he will run the Students' Union like the "\$2.5 million corporation it is". Taylor does say that the Union's goal is to provide services, and lobby the administration for a quality education. But that's not a job for "a \$2.5 million corporation", that's a job for a union of students -- a Students' Union.

Fraser Kirby is more focussed on what we feel is the real purpose of the Students' Union: promoting the interests of students, both in academics and services.

The Students' Union has, until very recently, taken little action about the cuts to academic programs at Laurier. Sean Taylor has criticized this inaction. Yet, he is not only a member of this year's Board -- he is the chair. As a student representative, he should have taken action this year, not just talked about what he would do if we elected him.

His actions -- or rather the lack thereof -- speak far louder than his words.

Fraser Kirby is not the perfect candidate. His proposal to recognize and expand fraternities and sororities at Laurier is disturbing since it potentially endorses sexist organizations and could violate the Union's anti-discrimination by-law.

This negative is outweighed by the pluses. He implicitly puts his trust in you, the students, to make decisions on issues of great importance. Kirby's bent towards democracy was further proven during his tenure as president of Student Publications. That year, for the first time, the board of Student Publications stood for public election.

Fraser Kirby has put his trust in you. Now, in our opinion, you should do the same.

Editorial by Cord Editorial Board

The opinions expressed in this editorial are those of the Cord Editorial Board and do not necessarily reflect those of the rest of The Cord staff, or WLU Student Publications.

Student Publications

Two names are on the ballot for Student Publications president: Brian Gear and Adrienne Hodgkin. One of these two people will become the third publicly elected president of Student Publications, the publisher of **The Cord**.

Obviously, we at **The Cord** have a keen interest in who becomes Student Publications president. Our interest is so keen that it has a special name: 'conflict of interest'. Despite this conflict, it is important to have an editorial on the election for Student Publications president. You elect the person, and pay for the organization which they will head. That merits comment. But with that comment comes the **Cord's** conflict of interest. Keep that in mind as you read the following commentary.

The differences that exist between Gear and Hodgkin are more of approach than of substance. Brian Gear views the role of the president as one of a moderator of conflicts between Student Publications departments, and of representing Student Publications in the political arena.

Adrienne Hodgkin is more internally focussed. She wants **The Cord** to "better reflect student concerns". She wants to improve **Cord** news and sports coverage. While those concerns are legitimate, they are less the concern of an administrator than of an editor.

Both candidates support the soon-to-be passed **Cord** Constitution. Gear terms the document "protection in a worst case scenario". Hodgkin regards the constitution as defining the respective roles of **The Cord** and the Board of Publications.

One area where the candidates do differ is on the changes to the by-laws of Student Publications. Like the Union, the Board of Publications voted to strike down a by-law requiring them to submit by-law changes to a vote before any such changes would become effective. Gear supports the change in by-laws, while Hodgkin would rescind them. His support is disappointing, but irrelevant.

Because students have the opportunity to defeat the changes to the Student Publications' by-laws. And defeat them you should. Co-op students were not given the chance to vote on these measures. No students have been given any explanation about the changes. A resounding 'no' vote should be delivered to Student Publications' by-law changes.

Gear has clear, specific plans on how to accomplish the herculean task of rebuilding the business office of Student Publications. As chair of the Board of Publications this year, he has shown consistent concern over the still-decrepit state of the Student Publications' business office. I believe he will get the job done.

Adrienne Hodgkin places much less emphasis on the finances of Student Publications. She is concerned with finances, but not as much as Gear. Her concern, I fear, falls short of that which is needed.

Next year is crucial for Student Publications. The organization must establish a firm financial base. That is the critical goal for Student Publications next year.

Brian Gear, in my opinion, is the person to achieve that goal.

Editorial by Pat Brethour, Editor-In-Chief

The opinions expressed in this editorial are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the rest of The Cord staff, or its publisher, WLU Student Publications.

INSIDE

The Cord's Vice-president vote.....page 2 Interviews with the candidates...pages 2-4

Vote for apathy.....page 2 A brief history of [election] time.....page 4

The Cord's pick for VP: University Affairs

The position of VP University Affairs is one of great importance and responsibility. The next VP will be dedicated to external affairs and hence has the ability to shape the Union for years to come. The following is a detailed examination of the VP candidates' platforms and past performance and the Cord's pick. Let's start with OUSA or the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance.

OUSA advocates both students and the government being more responsible for education. All five of the candidates have jumped on the OUSA bandwagon. Without the choice of a 'no' candidate, let's see how the candidates feel about those students who cannot afford the tuition increases.

Michelle Moore would tell the unfortunate student that the education system needs improvement and that costs must increase. Moore thinks we can all afford the increase, and if someone can't, oh well.

Cindy French plans to find the unfortunate student a job on campus. The university, after cutting over 20 full time equivalent positions, will not be able to give every needy student a job.

Tim Crowder feels that the students can handle the increases and if not, OSAP should be restructured. "Should" is rather ambiguous, at best, and unfortunately not all students are well off enough to afford any type of increase. Jim Lowe sides with Crowder on this one. He said that OSAP will take care of the unfortunate ones.

Terry Grogan offered no opinion on the fate of underfunded students, but took the time to call OUSA a step in the right direction.

No one candidate comes out shining on the OUSA issue. What about letting the students have a choice in joining the organization? Grogan, French, and Lowe advocate holding a referendum before getting too far into OUSA.

Moore and Crowder both want a referendum, but not right away. Crowder -- in an amazing feat of logic -- wants to hold off on a referendum so not to force other universities to do the same.

By having a referendum Laurier would be showing other universities it thought the cause was strong enough to put its money where its mouth was. Crowder seems too timid to make the move.

Moore wants to hold off on the referendum until OUSA is stronger -- or in other words until Laurier is too committed to back out. Students should have a say about increased tuition right away. Moore and Crowder would deny us this say.

The candidates all want to be accountable to the students by having an OUSA referendum, but with one exception they supported this year's BOD decision to amend bylaws without consulting the students.

Okay -- so the by-law will eventually get voted on by the students. It's the interim that counts. Tim Crowder was the only candidate to condemn the decision.

The question of an opt-out or opt-in health plan held more surprises than the Cord anticipated. It neatly eliminated two candidates, and put the spotlight on the other three.

French wanted to see a lower cost plan, while Grogan and Lowe felt satisfied with the current plan. Moore's support of an opt-in plan and Crowder's of an opt-out did not entirely disqualify them in the eyes of the Cord.

But when questioned about the consequences of their ideas, Crowder and Moore said that their personal thoughts on the matter did not matter. It was the will of the students that counted. How can you be VP without the ability to voice your own opinions? How can you vote at a Board meeting without holding a referendum each time you raise your hand? A VP that refuses to discuss and defend their own opinion is about as useful to the Union as a stale Torque Room muffin.

Crowder and Moore could not possibly hold the office of VP with such a fence-sitting attitude. Here's the scoop on the other three candidates. Cindy French has political experience as a member of the Senate and has sat on several university committees. This is good experience, but a VP must have workable ideas. If her job creation program is any example of her other plans for VP unfortunately they will not go far. French held up well at the open forums, but needed to think her plans through before putting them on paper.

Terry Grogan and Jim Lowe stand a head above the other three candidates when it comes to breaking down the Union's status quo. Grogan has his agenda firmly in mind and knows how to implement it. A good example of this is his involvement with Waterloo City council. Grogan took the initiative to contact City councillors and talk with them about the current student housing issue.

Lowe, however, has been involved with the Students' Union and Student Publications all year. Lowe has attended and contributed to the Board meetings of both corporations. This is where the real work of the corporations goes on and also is the place to become the most informed about the organization.

The Cord's final vote goes to Jim Lowe due to his progressive platform and heavy involvement in the Students' Union. Lowe ran for a Union Board position this fall and his involvement has not stopped. Grogan has done his homework, but has not been involved with the workings of the corporation. With a green acclaimed Board of Directors, the Union needs executives that are: experienced, have workable plans for the future, and are not afraid to make their opinions known and stand by them.

Jim Lowe has the above mentioned qualities, while the other four candidates completely lack them, or possess these essential qualities to a lesser extent.

A vote for Jim Lowe will be the breath of fresh air that the Union Board so badly needs.

Editorial by Cord Editorial Board

The opinions expressed in this editorial are those of the Cord Editorial Board and do not necessarily reflect those of the rest of The Cord staff, or of WLU Student Publications.

Boycott impotent election

Steve Doak Election Comment

In a world where most new ideas are conceived and nurtured in a university setting, Laurier students are notorious for being in the rear of progressive movements.

It is once again the time of the year to choose as leaders the students who can best satisfy the needs and desires of the student body as a whole. An choice that has been completely neglected is that of anarchy.

What if students refused to accept the candidates that have presented themselves so far? What if the population of this school realized that the student

government is taking money from the students without providing the services students need and the efficiency that should be an innate characteristic of a center of higher learning?

The purpose of the election is to vote for the individuals we want to lead us. Personally, I do not want to be led by any of the candidates that have presented themselves in this election. None of them seem to be capable of taking advantage of the Union's potential for the students.

Student politicians have often been accused of running for positions only to pad their resumes, but it is impossible to defend such a generalization of motives. On

the other hand, it is obvious that all of the candidates are unknown to most students on campus.

None of the candidates have taken a correct approach to the issues. They all seem to agree for the most part with their opponents. What they fail to point out is that these changes in the Union's policies should be decided by the students in a referendum. The only thing that separates a good student leader from a bad one is their dedication to the job and the amount of work they can get done.

In this key issue, however, none of the candidates have shown themselves to be superior to the others.

Student apathy has been a problem at WLU. No one wants to put out the effort to improve conditions here, other than a few select students who are willing to take a project from beginning to end. I do not support this kind of apathy, which is simply hidden impotence.

Rather, I protest something that we pay for without getting our money's worth while being told there's nothing we can do about it other than choosing leaders for next year that will probably continue the same pattern.

If enough people refuse to vote, potential leaders will have to realize they need to take things more seriously. Another election

could be forced, perhaps with the opportunity for a truly representative board. It would draw attention to students' dissatisfaction with the choices that are being made for them.

In any movement, there are a few leaders with knowledge and motivation. All other people involved are followers, for whatever reasons.

In this election, you should be aware of your alternatives and what the effects may be. You must choose if you want to follow and who you want to follow. You might even believe you know the right choice.

Just don't let yourself get fucked.

The

Students' Union President

Cathy-Jo Noble Election Special

Two candidates are vying for the presidency of the Students' Union: Fraser Kirby and Sean Taylor.

Both Kirby and Taylor were questioned about their stance on the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance, an opt-out health plan, by-law changes, an elected First Year Council and class cuts. Although both candidates agree on the broad issues, the tactics they would use to achieve these goals differ substantially.

The Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance [OUSA] has been the focus for external lobbying efforts this year. OUSA advocates a 30 per cent increase in tuition, to be matched by increased provincial grants and donations from business. Both candidates support the Students' Union's membership in OUSA, but differ on when Laurier students would be allowed to vote on OUSA.

Taylor would wait until a deal had been struck with business and government before having a referendum on membership in OUSA.

"I support the development of OUSA but I see no sense in taking this issue to a referendum until we have seen commitment from the university administration, the private sector and the Council of Ontario Universities, not just lip service," he said.

Fraser Kirby disagrees, saying student support from referenda will strengthen OUSA.

"I think for OUSA to have a strong mandate, it needs a very early and province wide commitment from students at universities such as Laurier," said Kirby. "OUSA will be able to grow with a mandate from official student referendums."

The Students' Union health

plan has become one of the major issues of this election. Currently, all students pay into the plan and all students are covered by the plan.

An "opt-out" health plan has been proposed which would allow students who did not want the health plan to receive a refund. An opt-out health plan has the potential to increase the health plan fee substantially for those students retaining coverage.

An "opt-in" health plan has also been proposed. Under this variant, students would have to go up to the Student Union offices to be signed on to the plan. An opt-in health plan would have even fewer subscribers than an opt-out plan -- with a corresponding rise in cost.

Fraser Kirby supports an opt-out health plan -- with qualifications.

"I support it [an opt-out health plan] within certain financial restrictions," he said. "If the cost is too great, I would find it hard to support. Furthermore, it is an important decision which students should be allowed to decide. I do not support an opt-in plan."

Taylor also supports an opt-out health plan. He would try to establish a cooperative health plan with nearby universities Guelph and Waterloo to keep down the cost of an opt-out health plan.

In November, the Board of Directors scrapped a by-law requiring that all changes to by-laws be approved by students before the change became effective. The Board may now pass whatever changes it wishes, without student approval -- removing an important constraint on the powers of the Board.

Any by-law changes must be ratified in the next election, how-

Candidates talk

ever, or they cease to have effect.

Both candidates support the decision of this year's Board to grant themselves the power to change by-laws without the prior consent of the students.

"I believe the BOD acted in the best interest of the students, but they should be very, very cautious about changing by-laws without the consent of the students," said Kirby.

Taylor -- who chaired the Board meeting at which the Board eliminated the provision requiring prior student consent -- would not rescind the by-law change either.

"Granted the BOD did not follow the customary process," he said. "But they did not break the law and I support the decision because it saves time and the students' money."

Christina Craft, current presi-

dent of the Students' Union, had included an elected First Year Council [FYC] in her platform in the 1992 student government election. This year's Board defeated the proposal.

Both Kirby and Taylor think that the FYC should remain hired, not elected.

"There should not be an election for First Year Council because the students are new to the school," Taylor said. "In order to give due time to give them an understanding of the school and the role of the Students' Union, it would be too late to have an election."

Kirby agrees, saying, "I think that the mandate of the First Year Council is not clear enough to justify the costs of an election."

Class cuts have prompted widespread protests from students this year. Petitions and open

forums have been organized -- while the Students' Union remained on the sidelines.

Fraser Kirby and Sean Taylor both say they would take a more activist role next year.

"The fact that students felt that they had to organize a movement themselves is a sign that the Students' Union was not representing students' concerns well," said Kirby.

"If that's the case, that's wrong. If the Students' Union is doing their job, they could have worked with these students and in turn got more than 1600 names on the petition."

Taylor also takes a critical view of the Students' Union's inaction on class cuts -- despite the fact that he is a member of this year's Board of Directors.

He says he would have supported the petition and gotten

more names and used the influence of the Students' Union presidency with the WLU president, conducted a letter writing campaign and notified the media.

Sean Taylor's platform states that he "intends to run the Students' Union like the \$2.5 million corporation it should be". Does this emphasis on the business aspect of the Union conflict with its traditional mission of representing students' interests?

Taylor says no. "[The] Students' Union is a corporation. To demonstrate success in the business perspective shows the organization has a sense of responsibility and professionalism," he said.

Taylor adds that the primary mandate of the Students' Union is to work with the administration for the quality of education, with the provision of facilities and ser-

ment funding, with increases matched to students' increases.

Crowder said another goal should be getting corporations, unions, and other bodies which benefit from the level of education more integrated with the education system to create students which fill these bodies' needs.

These organizations should also financially support universities.

Any increases in tuition would be ones that the student could handle, said Crowder. OSAP should be restructured to aid these students in getting an education without long term debt.

For students who cannot obtain OSAP, and cannot afford tuition fee increases, Crowder says students are in a "crisis". Lobbying the government for work-study programs, and more accessible OSAP is needed.

Libbi Hood Election Special

Jim Lowe

Question 1
The Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance is an organization concerned with funding and quality of education. Jim Lowe supports a referendum on OUSA and believes it is "the organization to best represent students in relation to the government." The major criticism of OUSA has been that it represents only a few student councils so in order to have the "essential credibility, students must have the chance to say yes."

Question 2
The mandatory health plan has been a prominent issue in this year's election campaigns. Lowe does not advocate an opt-out health plan and believes it is an "arrogant, self-serving attitude" that would attack the plan. He believes one of the great aspects of WLUSU is the package of services offered, and it is wrong to isolate any one of those services. Lowe believes the health plan is as essential to some people as Wilf's is to others.

Question 3
This year's BOD decision to allow by-laws to be changed without prior consent of the student body was the cause of much controversy. Lowe understands the decision and believes it was to the benefit of the students, yet at

vices being a secondary purpose.

Fraser Kirby includes "recognition and expansion of the Greek system [fraternities and sororities] at Laurier" in his platform. Such recognition could conflict with the Students' Union's anti-discrimination by-law, since fraternities and sororities discriminate on the basis of gender.

Kirby, however, downplays concerns about recognition of the Greeks and discrimination.

"I think that this issue about the Greek Societies has been blown out of proportion," he said. "I foster the development of all organizations on campus to increase student participation."

In terms of discrimination policies, each organization needs to be looked at differently in terms of mandate and environment."

the same time feels it "violated a principle of trust." Lowe stated the issue will be voted on in the referendum and the students would decide if they want "that protection" or not. If they do then it "sends a message as to the limits of the power of the Board."

Question 4
Lowe believes the students who could not afford the raise would benefit from OUSA's ICLRP (Income Contingency Loan Repayment Plan) which he hopes will make the system more accessible. He believes the quality of education matters along with the cost and a low quality degree will hurt the students in the future.

Michelle Moore

Question 1
Michelle Moore is in favour of a referendum on OUSA because it has such potential to be a catalyst of change. She feels it must go "back to the students" when the organization is stable. Moore wants a March information campaign, continued in September and put to vote in October or November, saying there is not enough time to have an effective information campaign for a March vote.

Question 2
The question of the opt-out health plan is one that Moore "can't directly answer." She supports giving the students a choice of a more expensive, opt-out plan, or a less expensive mandatory plan.

Question 3
As Moore is a member of this year's BOD she stated that she supported the decision. Moore continued that it is in the interest of democracy to go to the students, but not in the interest of a corporation to go back to its 5000 members for every decision. She believes the BOD is a representative body and it did approach students before making the decision.

Question 4
OUSA advocates a \$600 tuition increase, as well as loans which can be paid back in relation to income, stated Moore. She would tell the student who could not afford the increase that nobody is satisfied with the level of education and that money must be spent to better it. She also believes the money will not come from the government.

Vice-President: University Affairs

THE QUESTIONS

1. Do you support a referendum on OUSA?
2. Do you support an opt-out health plan?
3. Do you support this year's BOD decision to allow by-laws to be changed without the prior consent of the student body?
4. OUSA advocates a 30 per cent tuition increase in the next three years. What would you tell the student who could not afford the raise?

Kat Honey Election Special

Cindy French

Question 1
Cindy French feels that OUSA is such a fundamental change that all the students should be consulted on it. She said that although OUSA and OFS are similar in many ways, the students should be made aware of the differences between the two.

Question 2
French does not support an opt-out health plan. She does believe that the current health plan offers many benefits that students do not use, and some coverage that may be covered by Health Cards. She said that these benefits should be trimmed from our current health plan.

Question 3
French supports BOD's decision this year for two reasons. The high cost of holding a referendum was not a necessary cost to the students, since the students should try to elect representatives that would have the students' best interest in mind.

For those students who would prefer having changes brought to referendum, they should elect representatives that would "have quite a few referendums".

Question 4
French does not see it feasible for

tuition to do anything but increase. For a student that cannot afford tuition, French would match them up with a part time job at the school to help fund their education. Although this may not be the most favorable for everyone, "you do what you can to get through," she said.

Terry Grogan

Question 1
Grogan said that there should be a referendum on OUSA since it would be such a large change. As VP: University Affairs, Grogan would hold an information campaign to raise student awareness about OUSA in preparation for a referendum.

Question 2
Grogan does not support an opt-out health plan because there are many other services from which students may not opt-out. Grogan said if there is an opt-out health plan, students will feel in future years that contributing to other services should also be optional.

Question 3
"I think with the situation this year, when they changed the by-law mid-term, they acted very responsibly," said Grogan. As long as there was a referendum during the next election to approve the change retroactively, the change would be acceptable.

Grogan said that the people who changed the by-law would "probably not stick their necks out and pass something that they did not feel would be passed by a referendum".

Any major policy issues should be brought to referendum, but an internal operating issue can be left until later to be approved, he added.

Question 4
Grogan said that tuition will go up, but OUSA is "a step in the right direction" by having a com-

More interviews

Student Publications President

Greg Sloan *Election Special*

The two candidates running for Student Publications President, Brian Gear and Adrienne Hodgkin, agree on many of the issues but differ in how they would implement their policies.

This year a motion was passed by the Board of Publications allowing them to alter by-laws before they are passed by the student body at a general meeting. Gear supports the motion, feeling it allows the Board to work more efficiently.

"It only makes sense that our corporation would act according to the Corporations Act of Ontario. With the passage of the new constitution we will need new operational by-laws. The motion passed this year enables the Board to take action when necessary."

Gear doesn't feel that the motion is infringing on the rights of the students.

"If it is turned down by the students it will be rescinded," he said. "If something comes up over the summer the Board has to do something. If you have to wait for student approval then nothing can be done."

Hodgkin disagrees with Gear, saying that the students should not be forgotten. "The Board should not have that power. A by-law should always be brought before the students for accountability. It will hinder the Board somewhat but we should remember this is a democracy. It is important for the students to see it first."

Hodgkin says that while she disagrees with the decision there may not be much she can do about it. "This is a Board decision, not the Presidents. I will

push for rescinding the motion. However, if the board is against it there's not much I can do. I will do what I can, but finally it must be a Board decision."

Both candidates feel that the Cord constitution is important in helping to run the paper. Hodgkin says "it defines the role of the Cord and the Board and what powers they have in respect to each other. Now neither side can abuse its powers." Gear says the Constitution provides protection in a worst case scenario. "Its valuable because now when a conflict arises there is a formal document we can look at."

Next year the advertising department is returning to Student Publications from the Students' Union. Gear and Hodgkin say they will keep the department separate from the Cord. Gear says "the department will not be solely serving the Cord. It will be vital to both the Keystone and the Cord, similar to the Photo Department."

Hodgkin wants to see it run the same as it was under the Students' Union. Both candidates say that any disputes which arise between the Cord or the Keystone and the Ad department will be referred to the Board for the final decision. Gear and Hodgkin want to see the marketing campaign for the Keystone be increased. Hodgkin says a lot of people simply

are not aware of it.

"We have to try to reach as many students as we can. This can be done by becoming more involved in Frosh Week, appearing more in the Concourse and Atrium, and going to the Residences."

Gear says one idea to increase sales is to have the sales manager work on a commission basis to better motivate him or her. He has also thought about sales reps going off campus as well as the residences.

Both Gear and Hodgkin say that increased photo coverage would make the Keystone more interesting to the students.

Next year will see Student Publications have more control over their own finances. Gear says that the role of treasurer will have to be redefined. He mentioned the possibility of hiring someone to work with the treasurer in the future.

"If we continue to grow we will look at the possibility of hiring a part time or full time person as a bookkeeper or manager."

Hodgkin says this won't be necessary. "A Laurier student should be able to do it without outside help. They will receive the training they need to do the job."

In her platform Hodgkin proposed changes to the Cord. She

wants to implement a business page and diversify the news and sports sections. She says she will work closely with the editors and staff of the Cord in instituting her proposed changes. She says these are only suggestions, and she will not try to impose her will on the editors. They will have the final say.

She wants the paper to better reflect student concerns. "I would consider taking a poll of the students, and check out surveys which the Cord has done in the past to see if there is student interest in making these changes."

As the chair of the Board this year Gear has seen the financial situation of Publications stagnate. Gear says things will be different this year because of the new Operating agreement.

"Right now it is the Students' Union and not Student Publications which looks after finances. I'm upset with the way things have gone, but the Board had limited power over what it could do. With the new operation agreement we will gain more control, and this will improve the system."

Gear says he is happy that the shift will come gradually. "We will get a little bit over time, so it will not be thrown at us all at once. We will have to reacquire ourselves with how it functions."

A brief (Cord) history of (election) time

Mark Hand *Election Special*

As much as some people would like to think otherwise, what gets printed in *The Cord* has resounding impact on people's minds.

Cordies arrogantly believe that since for three weeks all we do in the editorial department is observe the campaigns, we have some kind of authority and responsibility to help the students of Laurier make their decision.

We thought it would be kind of fun to take a nostalgic look back at the history of Students' Union elections through the eyes of *The Cord*.

1972: Headline: "Elections Almost Called Off"

After Peter Catton won the election for Student Administrative Council [SAC] President, a number of whiny loser candidates appealed the election on the grounds that the winner had broken election rules by putting up more posters than was allowed under election regulations. The SAC passed the buck to the Dean's Advisory Council, who ruled that the election was valid.

1975: Headline: "Hansen nabs presidency"

An exceedingly dull year for news. No scandals, no big contests. *The Cord* doesn't support anyone, but does offer an indictment of the entire election process: "It is amazing, considering the past history of elections at WLU, that there is an election at all. Our tradition seems well

founded and deeply rooted in a premise of acclamations and non-elections." Hmmm...

1979: Headline: "Election coverage?"

In the years before Cordies learned to change their publishing schedule to fit the whims of WLUSU election date-setters, the editorial complained about how it was impossible to cover the election because they published on the election day. If *The Cord* printed the names of the candidates on election day, it was grounds for disqualifying the candidate, so no news coverage was possible. The editorial did list the names of every candidate however, just to prove a point.

1980:

What was wrong with the seventies? No scandals here. *The Cord* did publish on election day but resisted supporting any candidates. Mike Brown was elected president, with a \$550 honouraria for the year.

1983:

The Cord catches flak for "unfair" election coverage. They ran out of room in their election feature and left out what some candidates thought was important to their campaigns. Since it wasn't printed, I have no idea what it was that was left out.

1985: Headline: "In support of..."

At last, *The Cord* begins supporting candidates...and controversy flows like a river of

blood through the halls of the Student Union Building. In a very long editorial, the editorial board chooses Matt Certosimo over his opponent, Larry O'Reilly.

The next issue, published on election day, was exciting. The president was asked by the rest of the WLUSU executive to resign for his supposed "open support" of O'Reilly. He wrote a letter in response to *The Cord*'s editorial the week before saying O'Reilly was a qualified candidate.

Certosimo won. *The Cord*'s record of support: 1 for 1.

1986:

The Cord chickens out. No support given. Apart from almost everyone being acclaimed -- nothing new here -- there's no hubbub.

1987:

The Cord chickens out. Again. Editorial snootiness reads: "The Cord does not wish to endorse any candidates. Past experience has proven that a sober, analytical look at the candidates is not well-received".

1988:

A record six candidates run for president. Amazingly, the election is free from controversy. *The Cord* doesn't even mention supporting anyone, but does give the university administration a good rhetorical thumping about a referendum for fee increases. I think when they said "Well fuck them" in the editorial there pretty well wasn't much else to say.

1989: Headline: "It's more than just an 'X'"

My first year, so a real nostalgia piece for me here.

And the year *The Cord* had the gonads to support someone again. This time, it was Al Strathdee being praised in an editorial on the day of the election (Thursday), while contenders Terry Lennox and Keith Doan were, how shall I say this tactfully, *criticized highly*.

Strathdee waltzed away with the presidency. *The Cord*'s record of support: 2 for 2.

1990:

Those wily Students' Union people put the election on a Wednesday this year in hopes of preventing *The Cord* from supporting someone in print on the day of the election.

The Cord published on Wednesday that week.

The editorial did not support anyone, as such. Each of the four presidential candidates had their good and bad qualities listed...to be honest, some had more bad than good.

Stuart Lewis ended up winning by an obscenely huge margin, while surprise candidate Bill Needle took seven votes, only 673 behind the winner. So close but yet...

Out of sheer bitterness, I'm going to penalize *The Cord*'s pick record here. Record drops to 2 for 3.

1991:

Nick Jimenez is acclaimed. I was *Cord* news editor at the time

and really annoyed at not being able to at least support Nick. To sum up the election, one of my brilliant headlines read "Election controversy nonexistent".

1992: Where do we start?

My year as Editor-In-Chief. Again the election was on a Wednesday and again *The Cord* came out a day early. The editorial supported Christina Craft over her three contenders, Brett Grainge, John Smith, and Jeff Bowden. Sounds simple, but it wasn't.

Bowden was a controversial candidate from day one, since he did not have the full-time student status required for a presidential candidate. The Election Council decided he could run anyway, and an appeal went to the DAC. After the word "shall" was deemed to be 'ambiguous' by the DAC, Bowden was allowed to stay in the race.

Craft won the election, improving *The Cord*'s pick record to 3 for 4 (3 for 3, really, but I still can't let us off for that 1990 fiasco).

To make a long story short, eleven appeals were submitted to everyone from the Election Council to the DAC to the Mickey Mouse Club, over a supposed election policy violation by Craft because we supported her in the editorial. She became president, so obviously the appeals were fruitless.

1993: Nothing so far, but today is the election...

CREDITS

LAYOUT AND DESIGN: Dawna MacIvor, Lynn McCuaig, Steve Doak, Renée Ward, Sheldon Page, Pat Brethour

Copyright 1993. No part of this publication may be reproduced without permission of the Editor-In-Chief. Thanks to everyone who helped, especially Mr. Page and Ms. Ward and Mr. Ryan Feeley, for his graphic design.